Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1 through 19 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1 and claims 2, 4-6, 9, 12-14 and 16 which depend therefrom, 18, and 19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Pat. No. 5,952,046 ("Chayka") in view of U. S. Pat. No. 4,436,974 ("McMenamin"); claim 3, claims 7-8, claims 9-11, claim 15, and claim 17 remain rejected under Chayka in view of McMenamin and further in view of U. S. Pat. Nos. 6,098,964 ("Schmitt"), 5,556,479 ("Bran"), 4,539,221 ("Jacob"), 4,321,031 ("Woodgate"), and 5,966,499 ("Hinkle et al."), respectively. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of the claims because none of the cited references teach or suggestion, *inter alia*, "an electronic control module that is in electrical communication with the flow rate controller and the vaporizer module to deliver the chemical reagent vapors through the vaporized gas outlet at a certain flow rate based upon information received from the vaporizer module" as required in claims 1 and claims 2-17 which depend therefrom and claim 18 and "a vaporizer module comprising: an evaporative surface, a heat source, and a sensor in electrical communication with the evaporative surface and the electronic control module wherein the amount of liquid phase source material introduced into the vaporizer module and/or the heat source are controlled by the electronic control module based upon information obtained from the sensor" as required in claim 19. In this regard, Applicants can control the heat source to the vaporizer module such as, for example, by maintaining the evaporative surface at a constant temperature (see specification, for example, at Figure 2-3, paragraphs [0018]-[0019], and original claim 15). As a liquid source material vaporizes, the evaporative surface is cooled. To counteract the cooling of the evaporative surface, the energy input to heat source controlling the evaporative surface is increased to allow for continued vaporization of the liquid source material. As a result, the mass flow of the liquid source material is controlled

(*id.*). Applicants maintain that Chayka and McMenamin-alone or in combination with each other and/or the other cited references- fails to disclose all of the required elements of these claims nor does Chayka and McMenamin -alone or in combination with each other and/or the other cited references- provide a motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability of making the specific invention claimed by the Applicants.

Chayka describes a delivery system wherein a liquid source 114 stored in reagent reservoir 112 is vaporized in vaporizer 136 and delivered to a reactor 142 (see Chayka at Fig. 3 and col. 11, lines 39-64). A liquid mass flow controller 150 is used to conduct liquid directly from the reagent reservoir 112 to vaporizer 136 (see id. at col. 11, lines 48-52). Chayka regulates the amount of liquid source that enters into vaporizer 136 through a liquid mass flow controller 150 (see id. at col. 11, lines 48-52). Chayka fails, however, to disclose, *inter alia*, an electronic control module that is in electrical communication with the vaporizer module to directly influence the flow rate of the chemical reagent vapors based upon information obtained from the vaporizer module, as required in Applicants' claims.

The combination of Chayka with McMenamin fails to render obvious the claimed invention, nor is there any teaching, suggestion, or motivation within any of these references to make the combination. Unlike Applicants' invention, McMenamin does not use a vaporizer to produce a vapor. Instead, McMenamin teaches a bubbler-type delivery system wherein a carrier gas is bubbled through liquid 14 in bubbler 10, is saturated with the vapor, and then transported with the entrained vapor to the system. A vapor mass flow controller 40 receives inputs from bubbler 10 such as temperature (see temperature sensor 42) and pressure (see pressure sensor 50) to adjust the valve controlling the carrier gas flow 26 (see col. 4, lines 15-20 and Figure 1). McMenamin –like Chayka- does not teach, *inter alia*, an electronic control module that is in electrical communication with the vaporizer module to directly

influence the flow rate of the chemical reagent vapors based upon information obtained from the vaporizer module.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections of claims 1 and claims 2-17 which depend therefrom, 18, and 19 as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Chayka and McMenamin, in combination with each other and/or the other cited references, be removed.

SUMMARY

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned Attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosaleen P. Morris-Oskanian
Registration No. 47,321

7201 Hamilton Boulevard
Allentown, PA 18195-1501
(610) 481-8169